



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,743	03/18/2004	Thomas Rizk	19482.0017	5360

23517 7590 08/07/2006

BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP
3000 K STREET, NW
BOX IP
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

LEWIS, ALICIA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2164

DATE MAILED: 08/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/802,743

Applicant(s)

RIZK ET AL.

Examiner

Alicia M. Lewis

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


SAM RIMELL
ARTY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: the word "and" is missing on the last line of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.
2. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: the semicolon at the end of the claim should be a period. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Haverstock et al. (US Patent 6,434,607 B1) ('Haverstock').

With respect to claims 1 and 8, Haverstock teaches:

- identifying document access privileges for respective access role levels (column 5 line 56 – column 6 line 10, column 6 lines 59-65);
- classifying a user with a respective access role level (column 5 lines 58-60);

Art Unit: 2164

determining documents to provide to the user, and functionality performable on the documents based on the respective access role level (column 3 lines 9-16, column 6 lines 2-10 and lines 59-65); and

providing the documents and the functionality performable on the documents to the user (column 5 line 63 – column 6 line 10, column 6 line 59 – column 7 line 15).

With respect to claims 2 and 9, Haverstock teaches further comprising:
determining an information location to provide to the user based on the respective access role level (column 3 lines 28-54, column 6 line 59 – column 7 line 35).

Haverstock discloses that a user is permitted to access particular documents and fields based upon his/her access role level. He further discloses that the documents may be web pages, thus determining which web page and parts of a web page (fields) is equivalent to determining information location.

With respect to claims 3 and 10, Haverstock teaches further comprising:
providing the information location to the user (column 3 lines 28-54, column 6 line 59 – column 7 line 35).

With respect to claims 4 and 11, Haverstock teaches wherein the information location includes one of: a document location, a communications location, and a document processing location (column 3 lines 28-54, column 6 line 59 – column 7 line 35).

With respect to claims 5 and 12, Haverstock teaches further comprising:
providing documents specific information in response to the selection of a function
performable on a document (column 6 lines 2-10 and 59-65, column 7 lines 21-35).

With respect to claims 6 and 13, Haverstock teaches further comprising:
providing functionality performable on the document specific information (column 6 lines
2-10 and 59-65, column 7 lines 21-35).

With respect to claims 7 and 14, Haverstock teaches further comprising:
restricting the execution of a function performable on the document specific information
based on the respective access role level (column 6 lines 53-65).

With respect to claim 15, Haverstock teaches further comprising: a network
coupled to the first computer (element 54 in Figure 1, column 4 lines 20-22).

With respect to claim 16, Haverstock teaches further comprising: a second
computer, coupled to the network and the first computer, for accessing the first
computer (element 26 in Figure 1, column 4 lines 20-22).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Alicia M. Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-

5599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9 - 6:30, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on 571-272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alicia Lewis
August 2, 2006


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER